

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the *Office Action*. At the time of the *Office Action*, Claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 24-39 were pending and rejected. Applicants have amended Claims 7, 26, 30 and 32 and added dependent Claims 40 and 41. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Applicants' Summary of Interview

Applicants greatly appreciate the Examiner's participation in the telephone interview conducted on November 17, 2009 (the "*Interview*"). During the *Interview*, Applicants' attorney and the Examiner discussed the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112. Various proposed amendments and arguments regarding independent Claim 32 were also discussed. It is Applicants' understanding that the claims, as amended, would be allowable.

Section 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly having insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the public key." See *Office Action*, page 2. The Examiner also rejects Claim 8 as being dependent on a rejected claim. See *Id.* Applicants have amended Claim 7 in a manner which overcomes the § 112 rejection of that claim and places it in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that Claims 7 and 8 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner also rejects Claim 32 under § 112 as allegedly being indefinite for "failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant[s] regard[] as the invention." See *Office Action*, page 2. Per Applicants' agreement with the Examiner during the *Interview*, Applicants have amended Claim 32 in a fashion which renders the above-referenced § 112 rejection of that claim moot. Applicants thank the Examiner for her suggestions and comments.

Section 101 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Per Applicants' agreement with the Examiner during the *Interview*, Applicants have amended Claim 32 in a fashion which renders the above-

referenced § 101 rejection of that claim moot. Applicants again thank the Examiner for her suggestions and comments during the *Interview*. For at least those reasons, Applicants respectfully contend that each and every claim is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request full allowance of all the pending claims.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this case in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact Luke K. Pedersen, the Attorney for Applicants, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6655.

Applicants believe no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to **Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.**

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants



Luke K. Pedersen
Reg. No. 45,003
Phone: (214) 953-6655

Date: 11-17-09

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**